

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| Examiner | : | Gregory J. Strimbu |
| Art Unit | : | 3634 |
| Applicants | : | Philip O. Gerard |
| Serial No. | : | 10/042,738 |
| Filing Date | : | May 24, 2002 |
| For | : | WINDOW FRAME WITH BOTH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT CONNECTIONS |

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
 Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BOARD OF PATENT
APPEALS &
INTERFERENCES

SEP 23 2004

RECEIVED
 DEC 16 2004
GROUP 3600

REPLY BRIEF

The Examiner makes a new additional argument in the Examiner's Answer. This Reply Brief responds to that argument.

I. Hopper Does Not Disclose, Teach, Suggest, or Contemplate Rotating a Frame Half

The Examiner asserts that Hopper discloses rotating one of the frame halves in its own plane between a ship orientation and an install orientation, on the basis that "since applicant has failed to define any element of the invention which the second frame half is rotated with respect to, the second frame half can be moved between the ship and install orientations by simply rotating the whole assembly in its own plane."

The Examiner makes this assertion for the first time in the Examiner's Answer, despite the extensive prosecution history of this continuation application and its parent application. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion.

First, Hopper does not suggest or contemplate -- let alone teach -- 1) separate "ship" and "install" orientations or 2) rotating either or both frame halves between such two orientations. The only motivation for the Examiner's assertion is an improper attempted

hindsight reconstruction of the present invention. There simply is no support or motivation, either in Hopper or the art, for the Examiner's assertion.

Second, the claim must be read in the context of the specification and the extensive prosecution history of this continuation application and its parent. For example, the specification states at page 2, lines 20-22 that:

The frame halves can be oriented *with respect to one another* in either a "ship" orientation or an "install" orientation. The frame halves can be moved between the two orientations by rotating *one of the frame halves* by 180 degrees." (Emphasis added).

When properly read within the context of the specification and prosecution history, it is abundantly clear that the rotation of one frame half is respect to the other frame half.

For the reasons stated in this Reply Brief and the previous Appeal Brief, the Applicant remains of the opinion that the Examiners' rejections are improper and should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILIP O. GERARD

By: Warner Norcross & Judd LLP

Original Signed By
Charles E. Burpee

Charles E. Burpee
Registration No. 29 776
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487
(616) 752-2141

SEP 20 2004



United States Patent and Trademark Office

DOL 6816-003

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Warner, Norcross & Judd, LLP
Intellectual Property Practice Group
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487

Paper No: 13
Appeal No: 2004-2256
Application: 10/042,738
Appellant: Philip O. Gerard

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

SEP 16 2004

MAILED

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Docketing Notice

Application 10/042,738 was received from the Technology Center at the Board on August 17, 2004 and has been assigned Appeal No: 2004-2256.

A review of the file indicates that the following documents have been filed by appellant:

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Appeal Brief filed on: | March 18, 2004 |
| Reply Brief filed on: | NONE |
| Request for Hearing filed on: | NONE |

In all future communications regarding this appeal, please include both the application number and the appeal number.

The mailing address for the Board is:

**BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1450**

The facsimile number of the Board is 703-308-7952. Because of the heightened security in the Washington D.C. area, facsimile communications are recommended. Telephone inquiries can be made by calling 703-308-9797 and should be directed to a Program and Resource Administrator.

By order of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences



WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503-2487

Main Switchboard
616.752.2000

Fax Numbers
616.222.2313
616.752.2500

U.S. PATENT
AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE
APPEALS
INTERFERENCES

SEP 23 2004

Fax Cover Sheet

| | | | |
|-------------|---|----------------|---|
| Date: | September 23, 2004 | Pages: | 8, including this cover sheet |
| To: | Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences U.S. Patent and Trademark Office | From: | Chad E. Kleinheksel Warner Norcross & Judd LLP |
| Fax Number: | 703-308-7952 | Direct Dial: | 616.752.2313 |
| Telephone: | 703-308-9797 | Direct Fax: | 616.222.2313 |
| | | Email: | ckleinhekSEL@wnj.com |
| | | Client Number: | 11085.68161-003 |
| Remarks: | Re: Serial No. 10/042,738 Appeal No. 2004-2256 | | |

Attached is a copy of our Reply Brief (in triplicate) which we are resending to you in response to a Docketing Notice mailed September 16, 2004. This Reply Brief was originally mailed to you on August 6, 2004.

RECEIVED
 DEC 16 2004

GROUP 3600